

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated July 28, 2008. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the above amendments, claims 1-6 are cancelled; and claims 7-15 are newly presented. Thus, claims 7-15 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 7-9 are supported at least in Figs. 1-3 and pages 18-32 of the specification as originally filed. Claims 10-15 are supported at least in Fig. 4 and pages 32-41 of the specification as originally filed.

Next, to facilitate the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, the specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised in order to make a number of minor clarifying and other editorial amendments. Due to the nature of the revision involved, a substitute specification and abstract has been prepared. No new matter has been added. Also enclosed is a "marked-up" copy of the original specification and abstract to show the changes that have been incorporated into the substitute specification and abstract. The enclosed copy is entitled "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."

On page 2 of the Office Action, the title of the invention and the original specification are objected to by the Examiner. In response, the title of the invention has been amended to more clearly indicate the claimed invention. Also, as indicated above, the specification has been revised as required by the Examiner.

Next, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In response, claims 1-3 have been rewritten as new claims 7-9. Each of the new claims has been drafted to avoid the language considered unclear by the Examiner. Further, it

should now be clear that the low-permittivity substrate in one that is disposed close to the higher-permittivity substrate forming part of the Doherty-type amplifier section.

Next, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alley (U.S. Patent No. 6,320,462). It is submitted that the present invention, as defined in new claims 7-15, now clearly distinguishes over the Alley reference for the following reasons.

The present invention, as defined in claims 7-9, is directed to an amplifier having a substrate, forming at least part of the Doherty-type amplifier section, having a permittivity that is higher relative to the permittivity of a substrate disposed near the substrate of the Doherty-type amplifier section. The Alley reference is void of any disclosure related to the relative permittivity of the substrate(s) used in forming the amplifier as recited in claims 7-9.

Further, with respect to the rejection of claims 4-6, which generally correspond to new claims 10, 12 and 14, respectively, the Examiner takes the position that "Alley discloses in fig. 5 a Doherty amplifier circuit mounted on a GaAs substrate 82 with a ground plane 83 underneath."

The Examiner acknowledges that the Alley makes "no mention of temperature or humidity stability" but concludes that "a 'physically stable' substrate would have been an obvious requirement."

However, each of new claims 10-12 specifies that only a portion of the Doherty-type amplifier section includes a substrate material that is physically stable with respect to changes in humidity and temperature. This specifically claimed arrangement is not disclosed or suggested in the Alley amplifier circuit.

For example, as described in the present application, there is a possible technique of configuring a Doherty-type amplifier entirely with a highly-stable substrate material. However, a stable material typified by a ceramic substrate, for example, is expensive, and would result in increased cost of the device. Furthermore, if a ceramic substrate were employed, there is a possibility of cracking, and thus, it is difficult to make a single substrate to cover a large area (see page 6, lines 7 -14 of the present specification).

In each of claims 10, 12 and 14, only a specified portion is constructed using a substrate material that is physically stable. Clearly, the arrangement claimed in claims 10-12 is allowable over the teachings of Alley.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Junetsu URATA et al.

By: 
Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 28, 2008